APPENDIX A – Summary of Consultation Results and TRO objections

East Bank Road-Hurlfield Road zebra crossing scheme

| Request number | Most Recent opinion | Public Comments | Officer Response |
|----------------|---------------------|---|--|
| 1 | Don't support | The crossing is on a blind corner 2. The gateway will be dangerous at peak times 3. The old entrance to Springs Academy should be reinstated | The crossing is on a slight bend but not a blind corner and is the best location for pedestrian visibility and desire line, 2.this is a misunderstanding about the gateway as it is not a physical feature only a way of signing the traffic calming 3.the relocation of the Springs Academy entrance was ruled out during the development of the new academy. |
| 2 | Partly support | N/A | |
| age | Fully support | Strongly agree and fully support | |
| 25 4 | Fully support | 1, The cost of the scheme 2, Parking restrictions and raised areas prevent parking for residents and visitors 3, Children hardly ever cross at the existing crossing point so a new one would be a waste of money 4, The raised area would mean that residents cannot change their car positions 5, Car insurance would increase due to no off street parking and crime would increase if the cars were parked away from the houses Update 23/08/12 updated plan objection withdrawn | 2, The updated plan (C02) removes the raised areas in question to allow parking, 3, During my own observations the crossing area was well used, 4, (see 2), 5, (see 2). |
| 5 | Fully support | 1, Some cars seem to speed up after leaving the lights outside the school 2, The zebra crossing is a very good idea, cars parking on the bend restrict the view of drivers 3, I agree with having a tighter junction on Hurlfield Road | |
| 6 | Fully support | I think it is very good | |
| 7 | Fully support | This will reduce traffic speed & therefore reduce accidents occurring | |
| 8 | Fully support | N/A | |
| 9 | Don't support | The proposed gate feature will multiply traffic congestion 2, Very angry to see proposed double yellow lines Leave me no parking 3, children cross the road with no consideration or self awareness | 1, this is a misunderstanding about the gateway as it is not a physical feature only a way of signing the traffic calming, 2, on the new plan (C02) the double yellow lines in question have been removed. |

| | | | T |
|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| 10 | Fully support | Believes that there will still be a problem with driver travelling North East along Hurlfield Road and turning left. | The introduction of the zebra crossing will not make this situation any more dangerous, the situation will be monitored during the Stage Three Road Safety Audit and if a problem is identified additional measures will be taken. |
| 11 | Not sure | Providing the scheme is policed so that the law is adhered to, it may work out | |
| 12 | Fully support | Concerns over the parking arrangements outside his house | On the new plan (C02) the raised areas in question have been removed to allow parking behind the double yellow lines. |
| 13 | Fully support | Far too many speed up from East Bank Road onto Hurlfield, lots of accidents on junction | |
| 14 | Fully support | 1, 24 hours a day traffic flows freely 2, children have no discipline and play chicken with cars 3, will slow traffic but may bring it to a halt 4, doesn't support the majority of the measures children only here part of the day Update 16/08/12 updated plan objection withdrawn | The scheme will only have a minor impact of traffic flow when someone uses the crossing 3, (see 1) 4, the main aim of the scheme is for children but this crossing is intended for all pedestrians. |
| 15 | Fully support | 1, supports the measures but strongly disagrees with the DYL outside number 2, would also like a hump rather than cushions Update 27/08/12 updated plan objection withdrawn | The new plan (C02) removes the double yellow lines in question. 2, cushions have been used to tie in with the existing scheme and are more effective in slowing traffic. |
| ; əɓe∄ | Partly support | The crossing will only partly help children, would like to see another crossing on Hurlfield Road 2, the raised areas will restrict parking too much and cause a lack of parking 3, would like to have residents parking | 1, The budget of the scheme would not cover a second crossing, traffic speed will be reduced due to the tightening of the junction, the situation will be monitored during the Stage Three Road Safety Audit and if a problem is identified additional measures will be taken. 2, The amount of parking has now been increased from the original plan, 3, A residents parking scheme could be considered at a later date but is not part of the scope of the scheme. |
| 26 | Fully support | This scheme is helpful partly to relieve situation of illegal parking Update 23/08/12 updated plan objection withdrawn | |
| 18 | Partly support | The location of the crossing is incorrect, should be closer to Dagnam Road 2, Strongly disagree with the raised parking as this will remove parking for additional vehicles 3, no need for double yellow lines on the triangle | The Zebra crossing is located in the best position within the scheme limits for both the safety and desire line of the pedestrians wishing to cross 2, The amount of parking has now been increased from the original plan 3, Due to the removal of some parking, the road adjacent to the triangle may start to be used. |
| 19 | Don't support | Not needed because there hasn't been a crash for a very long time | This is not correct as the accident statistics show |
| 20 | Don't support | N/A | |
| 21 | Fully support | N/A | |
| 22 | Fully support | N/A | |
| 23 | Partly support | We don't agree to the double yellow line as there will not be anywhere else for our family & visitors to park | The waiting restrictions are essential to provide adequate visibility, The property has a driveway and garage, the new plan (C02) has reinstated some parking opposite the property which could be used. |
| 24 | Fully | Update 31/08/12 updated plan objection withdrawn | |

| | support | | |
|--------------|-------------------|--|--|
| 25 | Not sure | This would bring about more problems than it solves. Would like signs to prevent parking on Hurlfield Court | Hurlfield Court is a private road and does not fall within the jurisdiction of the City Council. |
| 26 | Fully support | N/A | |
| 27 | Partly support | I think this crossing has been needed for years 2, There is no crossing provision to get onto the island 3, The crossing should be located a few yards up the road before the bus stop this would then serve people going to Arbourthorne | 2, There is no budget for an additional crossing but the speed of Hurlfield Road will be reduced with the tightening of the junction, the situation will be monitored during the Stage Three Road Safety Audit and if a problem is identified additional measures will be taken, 3, by locating the crossing on the island it balances the pedestrian desire to access both Arbourthorne and the Manor Top tram stop, etc. |
| 28 | Fully support | I support this because there have been to many accidents happen and this will be a good thing to happen | |
| 29 | Fully support | Whilst I agree in principle to the scheme, double yellow outside our houses will obviously be inconvenient when deliveries are made, and parking of our vehicles will become more difficult. Update 28/08/12 updated plan objection withdrawn | The new plan (C02) has removed the proposed waiting restrictions in question. |
| ₩age 2 | Don't support | 1, There have only been 4 non fatal accidents in the past 5 years! Not really a major problem. 2, Road humps do slow traffic down and are very good at ruining suspension on cars, 3, children coming from Ridgeway Road should cross at the traffic lights on the crossing. | 1, Pedestrian safety and especially that of children is taken very seriously and four accidents in five years is a high percentage 2, The humps/cushions used in Sheffield comply with central government guidelines, these are seen as essential for slowing traffic to an acceptable speed for the zebra crossing 3, This is a too far away from the desire line of many pedestrians crossing East Bank Road. |
| 27 31 | Fully support | The raised areas to prevent parking in conjunction with the double yellow lines will severely restrict the ability of the residents to accept guests/deliveries etc. Update 24/08/12 updated plan objection withdrawn | On the new plan (C02) the raised areas in question have been removed to allow parking behind the double yellow lines. |
| 32 | Fully support | Has needed a crossing for years | |
| 33 | Fully support | I am disabled and find the traffic comes from Manor Top to fast. So it is difficult to get across the road. | |
| 34 | Don't support | It will stop my family, visitors and deliveries being able to park outside my house. 2, It will force children to cross between traffic when they get across East Bank, 3,it will cause difficulty for me to use my drive as I have to turn out then in and there will be more traffic | 1, The house in question has a two car driveway, unfortunately the restrictions on parking are essential to maintain visibility, alternative parking/loading can be found 14 metres away 2, The scheme will improve pedestrian safety on East Bank Road but will not adversely effect safety on Hurlfield Road, the situation will be monitored during the Stage Three Road Safety Audit and if a problem is identified additional measures will be taken 3, The raised areas will not encroach on the driveway in question and the scheme will not increase traffic flow. |
| 35 | Fully support | I have concerns about the raised kerb outside my home. My daughter and granddaughter park there when bringing my meals and visiting, due to my age this | On the new plan (C02) the raised areas in question have been removed to allow parking behind the double yellow lines. |

| | | happens every day. | |
|----|------------------|--|--|
| 36 | Fully support | N/A | |
| 37 | Fully support | I disagree with the double yellow lines There is nowhere to park my car I do not want to park my car away from the house Update 23/08/12 updated plan objection withdrawn | The new plan (C02) removes the double yellow lines in question |
| 38 | Don't support | The proposed crossing takes the children onto a small triangle with no aided crossing from it | Traffic speed will be reduced due to the tightening of the junction, the situation will be monitored during the Stage Three Road Safety Audit and if a problem is identified additional measures will be taken |
| 39 | Don't support | I have the right to return home without fear of abuse or violence and your proposed plans would have me and my children living in fear. With your proposed plans it means I would have to park round by Arbourthorne shops and walk home | The new plan (C02) removes the double yellow lines in question |